

# Lecture 7 : More on harmonic functions

## I. Fourier Series

This is a nice application of the Theorem on Dirichlet's problem from lecture 6. Moreover, it gives a better idea of what the harmonic functions of that Theorem look like.

Let  $f \in C^0_{\mathbb{R}}([0, 2\pi])$ ,  $f(0) = f(2\pi)$ . The Theorem just mentioned guarantees the existence of  $u \in C^0(\overline{D_1})$  satisfying:

(a)  $u|_{D_1}$  is harmonic, hence of the form

$$u(re^{i\theta}) = \operatorname{Re} \left( \sum_{n \geq 0} a_n (re^{i\theta})^n \right) \quad \left. \begin{array}{l} a_0 = 2 \operatorname{Re} a_0 \\ a_{n>0} = \operatorname{Re} a_n \\ b_n = -\operatorname{Im} a_n \end{array} \right\}$$

$$(*) \quad = \frac{a_0}{2} + \sum_{n \geq 1} a_n r^n \cos(n\theta) + \sum_{n \geq 1} b_n r^n \sin(n\theta),$$

where the series are absolutely and uniformly convergent on  $\overline{D_r}$  for  $r < 1$

(b)  $u(e^{i\theta}) = f(\theta).$

Now using basic trigonometric integrals, (a) gives

$$\frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \cos(n\theta) u(re^{i\theta}) d\theta = a_n r^n$$

$$\frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \sin(n\theta) u(re^{i\theta}) d\theta = b_n r^n.$$

Taking  $r \rightarrow 1^-$  and using (uniform) continuity of  $u$  on  $\bar{D}_1$ , together with (b),

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \cos(n\theta) f(\theta) d\theta &= a_n \\ \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \sin(n\theta) f(\theta) d\theta &= b_n. \end{aligned} \right\} (*)$$

(\*) may be regarded as the definition for further coefficients of  $f$ . Together with (a), this gives a formula for  $u|_{D_1}$  as a series. What about  $f$ ?

This is a nontrivial question, since "the series converges to  $u$  on  $D_1$ " and " $u$  is continuous on  $\bar{D}_1$ " do NOT imply that the series converges to  $u$  on  $\partial D_1$ .

Since  $f$  is (uniformly) continuous,  $\forall \epsilon > 0 \exists \delta > 0$  s.t.  $|\theta_2 - \theta_1| < \delta \Rightarrow |f(\theta_2) - f(\theta_1)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ . This means that for  $n > \frac{2\pi}{\delta}$  (i.e. sufficiently large),

$$\left| \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\frac{2\pi}{n}m}^{\frac{2\pi}{n}(m+1)} f(\theta) \cos(n\theta) d\theta \right| = \left| \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\frac{2\pi}{n}m}^{\frac{2\pi}{n}(m+1)} \tilde{f}_m(\theta) \cos(n\theta) d\theta \right|$$

$\left( f\left(\frac{2\pi}{n}m\right) + \tilde{f}_m(\theta), \text{ where } \left|\tilde{f}_m(\theta)\right| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \text{ since } \frac{2\pi}{n} < \delta \right)$

$$< \frac{1}{\pi} \cdot \frac{2\pi}{n} \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \frac{\epsilon}{n}$$

$$\Rightarrow |a_n| = \left| \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\frac{2\pi}{n}m}^{\frac{2\pi}{n}(m+1)} f(\theta) \cos(n\theta) d\theta \right| < \epsilon. \quad (**)$$

So  $a_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . (Similar for  $b_n$ )

But this isn't good enough for convergence, and indeed if  $\mathcal{S} \subset [0, 2\pi]$  is any set of measure zero, then  $\exists f \in C^0([0, 2\pi])$  whose Fourier series diverge (unboundedly!) on  $\mathcal{S}$ . A famous theorem of Carleson implies that the Fourier series at least converges pointwise almost everywhere, but still this is a bit shocking.

(A) when you first learn Fourier series from physicists who repeat the mantra that  $f \in C^k \Rightarrow a_n \sim \frac{1}{n^{k+2}}$

(B) in light of our theorem on Dirichlet for  $D_1$ .

The problem is that, while  $a_n$  limits to  $f(e^{i\theta})$  at each point  $e^{i\theta} \in \partial D_1$ , this statement amounts

to Abel summability of the Fourier series at  $\theta_0$ , which is weaker than ordinary summability!

To fix this, suppose now that  $f$  is everywhere differentiable, with bounded derivative (weaker than  $C^1$ ).

Then  $\|f'\|_{[0, 2\pi]} \leq M$ , and so if  $\epsilon = \frac{2\pi M}{n}$  then we can take  $\delta = \frac{\epsilon}{M} = \frac{2\pi}{n}$   $\Rightarrow |n c_n| \leq \frac{2\pi M}{\epsilon} \cdot \epsilon = 2\pi M$  ( $\forall n$ ). (Same for  $b_n$ ).

If  $f$  is  $C^1$ , then  $\int$  by parts

$$\begin{aligned} |a_n| &= \left| \frac{1}{n} \int_0^{2\pi} f(\theta) \cos(n\theta) d\theta \right| = \left| -\frac{1}{n} \int_0^{2\pi} f'(\theta) \sin(n\theta) d\theta \right| \\ &\stackrel{[\sin]}{\leq} \frac{\epsilon}{n} \quad \begin{array}{l} [+] \\ [\cos] \end{array} \\ &\stackrel{[\sin]}{\leq} \frac{\epsilon}{n} \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{same technique (appl.)} \\ \text{to } f' \text{ as in the} \\ \text{derivation of (KA).} \end{array} \end{aligned}$$

and we conclude that  $|n a_n| \rightarrow 0$ .

In the first case ( $n a_n$  bounded) we can use Littlewood's theorem, in the second case ( $n a_n \rightarrow 0$ ) Turbin's theorem,  $\uparrow$  to assert that  $(\forall \theta_0)$

$\downarrow$  see Appendix

$$f(\theta_0) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} u(re^{i\theta_0})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-} \left( \frac{a_0}{2} + \sum_{n \geq 1} \left[ a_n \cos(n\theta) + b_n \sin(n\theta) \right] r^n \right) \\
 &= \frac{a_0}{2} + \sum_{n \geq 1} \left[ a_n \cos(n\theta) + b_n \sin(n\theta) \right]
 \end{aligned}$$

(and that this last expression converges). *see Appendix*

Conversely, by Abel's theorem, whenever the last expression converges, the  $\lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-}$  must equal it ; and since the  $\lim_{r \rightarrow 1^-}$  gives  $u(re^{i\theta_0}) = f(\theta_0)$ , we have the

**Theorem** Let  $f \in C^0_{\text{RR}}([0, 2\pi])$  and  $a_n, b_n$  be its Fourier coefficients. Then :

(i) Whenever  $\frac{a_0}{2} + \sum_{n \geq 1} a_n \cos(n\theta) + b_n \sin(n\theta)$  (the Fourier series of  $f$ ) converges, it converges to  $f(\theta)$ .

(ii) The Fourier series converges everywhere if  $f$  is everywhere differentiable, with bounded derivative.

## Appendix to § I: Abel, Tauber, & Littlewood

To complete our discussion of these results, we recall what Abel & Tauber say for a function

$$f(x) := \sum a_n x^n \quad \text{on } (-1, 1).$$

Abel:  $\sum a_n$  converges  $\Rightarrow f$  has continuous extension to  $(-1, 1]$  (by setting  $f(1) := \sum a_n$ )

Tauber:  $f$  has continuous extension to  $(-1, 1]$  (and  $n a_n \rightarrow 0$ )  $\Rightarrow \sum a_n$  converges (to  $f(1)$ ).

So Tauber's theorem is a conditional converse.

There's a stronger version due to Littlewood, relaxing " $n a_n \rightarrow 0$ " to  $|n a_n| \leq B$ .

## II. Harnack's principle

As an application of the Poisson formula, we get bounds on values of a harmonic function  $u \in \mathcal{H}(\bar{D}_1)$ .

For instance, if  $u \geq 0$  and  $u(0) = 1$ , then  $u\left(\frac{3}{4}\right) \in [\frac{1}{7}, 7]$ .

This is a special case of

Harnack's inequality (1887)

nonnegative,  $z \in D_R$ . Then

$$\frac{R-|z|}{R+|z|} u(0) \leq u(z) \leq \frac{R+|z|}{R-|z|} u(0).$$

Remark // If the disk isn't centered at the origin, an obvious corollary (just by shifting everything) is

$$\frac{R-|z-z_0|}{R+|z-z_0|} u(z_0) \leq u(z) \leq \frac{R+|z-z_0|}{R-|z-z_0|} u(z_0). //$$

Proof : The Poisson formula says

$$u(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} u(Re^{i\theta}) \frac{R^2 - |z|^2}{|Re^{i\theta} - z|^2} d\theta.$$

We have

$$\frac{R^2 - |z|^2}{|Re^{i\theta} - z|^2} \leq \frac{R^2 - |z|^2}{(R - |z|)^2} = \frac{R + |z|}{R - |z|}$$

and

$$\frac{R^2 - |z|^2}{|Re^{i\theta} - z|^2} \geq \frac{R^2 - |z|^2}{(R + |z|)^2} = \frac{R - |z|}{R + |z|}.$$

Since  $\underbrace{u(Re^{i\theta})}_{\text{const.}} \geq 0$ , we can multiply both of these inequalities by this. So

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} u(Re^{i\theta}) \frac{R - |z|}{R + |z|} d\theta \leq u(z) \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} u(Re^{i\theta}) \frac{R + |z|}{R - |z|} d\theta$$

n  $\xleftarrow{\text{MVT}}$  l

$\frac{R - |z|}{R + |z|} u(0)$

$\frac{R + |z|}{R - |z|} u(\infty)$

□

### Harnack's Principle (1887)

Let  $U$  be a region,

and  $\{u_j\} \subset H(U)$  a sequence with  $u_1 \leq u_2 \leq \dots$ .

Then  $u_j \rightarrow u$  uniformly on compact sets (of  $U$ )

OR  $\exists u \in H(U)$  s.t.  $u_j \rightarrow u$  uniformly on compact sets.

Remark // So, for example, an increasing sequence of harmonic functions with  $\{u_j(z_0)\}$  bounded for one  $z_0 \in U$ , converges to a harmonic function! This seems so surprising that when Harnack told it to Felix Klein, the latter refused to accept its validity! //

Proof: Set  $U^{\text{fin}} := \{z \in U \mid \lim u_j(z) < \infty\}$

$$U^\infty := \{z \in U \mid \lim u_j(z) = \infty\}.$$

First suppose  $U^\infty \neq \emptyset$ : for  $p \in U^\infty$ ,  $\exists J$  s.t.

$u_j(p) > 0$  for  $j \geq J$ . Clearly  $\exists R$  s.t.  $\bar{D}(p, R) \subset U$

and  $u_j|_{\bar{D}}$  (hence every  $u_j|_{\bar{D}}, j \geq J$ ) is positive.

So Harnack's inequality applies, and for  $z \in D(p, R_2)$

$$u_j(z) \geq \frac{R - |z - p|}{R + |z - p|} u_j(p) \geq \frac{R - R_2}{R + R_2} u_j(p) = \frac{u_j(p)}{3} \rightarrow \infty$$

and  $u_j(z)$  goes uniformly to  $\infty$  on  $D(p, R_2)$ .

Next suppose  $\exists q \in U$  s.t.  $u_j(q) \rightarrow \lambda < \infty$ , i.e.

$q \in U^{\text{fin}} (\neq \emptyset)$ , and let  $\bar{D}(q, s) \subset U$ . Harnack's inequality applies to the differences, which are nonnegative, so for  $z \in D(q, \frac{s}{2})$

$$0 \leq u_{j+k}(z) - u_j(z) \leq \frac{s + |z - q|}{s - |z - q|} \cdot (u_{j+k} - u_j)(q) \leq \frac{s + s_2}{s - s_2} (u_{j+k}(q) - u_j(q))$$

$\downarrow j \rightarrow \infty$

$\Rightarrow \{u_j\}$  uniformly Cauchy in  $\|\cdot\|_{D(q, s_2)}$

$\Rightarrow \{u_j\}$  converges pointwise to some function  $u$  (uniformly in  $D(q, s_2)$ )

$\Rightarrow u$  is harmonic on  $D(q, s_2)$ .

(Carolling  
to TVM)

Conclude that  $U^{\text{fin}}, U^\infty$  are both open.

Moreover, clearly  $U = U^{\text{fin}} \sqcup U^\infty$ , and so  
 $U$  connected  $\Rightarrow U^{\text{fin}}$  or  $U^\infty$  is empty.

Further, for  $K \subset V$  compact,  $K$  is covered by  
a finite collection of balls  $D(p, R_2)$  or  $D(q, s_2)$   
as above; and by uniformity of  $u_j \rightarrow u$  on  $U$   
on these balls, we get uniform convergence on  $K$ . □